1	ROBERT B. HAWK, SBN 118054 HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP	
2	4085 Campbell Avenue, Suite 100	
3	Menlo Park, CA 94025 Tel: (650) 463-4000	
4	Fax: (650) 463-4199 robert.hawk@hoganlovells.com	
5	HELEN TRAC, SBN 285824 HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP	
6	3 Embarcadero Center, Suite 1500 San Francisco, CA 94111	
7	Tel: (415) 374-2300 Fax: (415) 374-2499	
8	helen.trac@hoganlovells.com	
9	JAMES TANSEY, SBN 293332 HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP	
10	100 International Drive Baltimore, MD 21202	
11	Tel: (410) 659-2700 james.tansey@hoganlovells.com	
12	Attorneys for Defendant	
13	Mercedes-Benz USA, LLC	
14	UNITED STATES D	SISTRICT COURT
15	NORTHERN DISTRIC	T OF CALIFORNIA
16	OAKLAND DIVISION	
17	STEVE FERRARI, MIKE KEYNEJAD, and	
18	PATRICIA RUBIN, individually and as representatives of the Class of Persons similarly	Case No.
19	situated,	NOTICE OF REMOVAL OF ACTION
20	Plaintiffs,	UNDER THE CLASS ACTION FAIRNESS ACT, 28 U.S.C. § 1453 et
21	V.	seq.
22	AUTOBAHN, INC. DBA AUTOBAHN MOTORS; MERCEDES-BENZ USA, LLC;	
23	SONIC AUTOMOTIVE, INC.; AND SPEEDWAY MOTORSPORTS, INC.	
24	Defendants	
25		J
<ul><li>26</li><li>27</li></ul>		
28		
20		Nomice of Privative
		NOTICE OF REMOVAL

1	TO THE CLERK OF THE ABOVE ENTITLED COURT AND TO ALL PARTIES ANI		
2	THEIR COUNSEL OF RECORD:		
3	PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Defendant Mercedes-Benz USA, LLC ("MBUSA") hereby		
4	removes this action from the Superior Court of the State of California for the County of San		
5	Mateo to the United States District Court for the Northern District of California, Oakland		
6	Division.		
7	In support thereof MBUSA states as follows:		
8	1. This is a putative nationwide class action wherein the amount in controversy		
9	exceeds \$5,000,000. Pursuant to the provisions of the Class Action Fairness Act ("CAFA"), 28		
10	U.S.C. § 1453 et seq., this case is properly removable to federal court. 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d).		
11	2. Plaintiffs Steve Ferrari, Mike Keynejad, Patricia Rubin, Hooshang Jowza, Celso		
12	Frazao, Renuka Narayan, Gertrud Frankrone, Ernest Salinas, Kalkhusan Sareen, Hossein Jalali,		
13	Ron Wolfe, Sohrab Rahimzadeh, Fred Grant, Ester Grant, Jessica Langridge, Tony Nicolosi,		
14	Donald Lyang, Artur Semichev, John Diaz, Harold Fethe and Ray Gapasin filed a Class Action		
15	Complaint ("Complaint") on December 20, 2016. Plaintiffs filed the Complaint on behalf of		
16	themselves and on behalf a proposed class of persons comprising:		
17	(a) A war war was a sufficient of a favorable way of the war of th		
18 19	(a) Any person or entity who brought one or more Mercedes-Benz automobiles to Autobahn Motors, in Belmont, CA during the period of 2005-present for repairs and/or maintenance; who received non-OEM/non-genuine/approved Mercedes Benz parts,		
supplies, and/or oil from Autobahn Motors without the customers' conse invoiced for OEM parts at OEM prices;			
21	(b) All Buyers of pre-owned Mercedes Benz from. Autobahn Motors during the period 2005-present who had zMAX, MOC products, non-approved oil or oil filters, or any other		
22	non-OEM product put into their car;		
23	(c) All Buyers of automobiles from any dealership of Sonic Automotive [approximately 134] that places zMAX, MOC products, non-approved oil or oil filters, into the used or		
24	preowned car inventory during the period 2005-present who had zMAX or any other non OEM product put into their car;		
25	Complaint at ¶ 64. MBUSA was served with a copy of the Complaint and Summons on		
26	December 28, 2016.		
27	Diversity Jurisdiction Under CAFA		
28	3. Enacted to expand federal diversity jurisdiction over purported class actions,		

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- CAFA provides that a class action may be removed in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 1446 if: (a) membership in the class is not less than 100; (b) any member of the plaintiff class is a citizen of a foreign country or a state different from any defendant; and (c) the aggregate amount in controversy exceeds \$5,000,000. *See* 28 U.S.C. §§ 1453(b) and 1332(d).
- 4. CAFA's first requirement—that class membership be no less than 100 (28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(5)—is satisfied. Plaintiffs allege that Autobahn, Inc. purchased 17,795 non-OEM oil filters that it used in its customers' vehicles (Complaint at ¶ 35), and that "the true number of victims . . . is in excess of ten thousand, which satisfies the numerosity requirement for a class action." *Id.* at ¶ 39. Accordingly, a reasonable basis exists to conclude that there are more than 100 members of the class.
- 5. CAFA's second requirement—that any one member of the purported class is a citizen of a state different from any defendant, (28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(2)(A))—is also satisfied. Per the Complaint, Defendants Sonic Automotive, Inc. and Speedway Motorsports, Inc. are incorporated in Delaware and have their principal places of business in North Carolina, and Defendant MBUSA is incorporated in Delaware and has its principal place of business in Georgia. Complaint at ¶¶ 31-33. Plaintiffs Ferrari, Keynejad and Rubin are California citizens. Complaint at ¶¶ 4-6.
- 6. CAFA's third requirement—that the aggregate amount in controversy exceeds \$5,000,000 exclusive of interest and costs (28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(2))—is satisfied as well. Although MBUSA disputes the theories of liability and asserted remedies advanced in the Complaint, Plaintiffs nonetheless seek in the Complaint, among other things, restitution for the purchase price paid by the class of consumers to Autobahn, Inc. for non-OEM oil filters, in an amount totaling \$7,118,000. Complaint at ¶ 122; see also id. at ¶ 123 (alleging damages in excess of \$21 million). This amount, without more, puts more than \$5,000,000 in controversy. Accordingly, the Complaint its face claims which, if true, far states exceed CAFA's jurisdictional minimum.
- 7. In addition, Plaintiffs also seek other damages, including exemplary damages and injunctive relief, which will increase the amount in controversy. *See, e.g., Tompkins v. Basic*

1	Research LLC, 2008 WL 1808316, *4 (E.D. Cal. April 22, 2008) (defendants' cost of compliance		
2	with an injunction is factored in to the amount in controversy).		
3	Intra-district Assignment		
4	8. As this action arose in the County of San Mateo, assignment to the San		
5	Francisco/Oakland Division of the United States District Court for the Northern District of		
6	California is proper. See Civil L.R. 3-2(d).		
7	Procedural Requirements Under Removal Statute		
8	9. The procedural requirements set forth in 28 U.S.C. § 1446 are also satisfied here.		
9	Section (a) of that statute requires the removing party to file a notice of removal "in the district		
10	court of the United States for the district and division within which such action is pending,"		
11	which MBUSA does with this filing. Section (a) also requires a moving party to provide a copy		
12	to the district court of all process, pleadings, and orders in the state action. The Complaint,		
13	summons, and other documents in MBUSA's possession are attached hereto as Exhibit A. <sup>1</sup>		
14	10. MBUSA was served with the Summons and Complaint on December 28, 2016.		
15	This Notice of Removal is filed within thirty (30) days of said date, and within one year of the		
16	date of commencement of the action. Accordingly, MBUSA's filing of this Notice of Removal is		
17	timely. See 28 U.S.C. §1446(b)(3).		
18	11. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1446(d), copies of this Notice of Removal are being		
19	served upon counsel for Plaintiffs and filed with the Clerk of the Superior Court of California for		
20	the County of San Mateo. <sup>2</sup>		
21	Based upon the foregoing, MBUSA therefore respectfully submits: (i) that this Court has		
22	diversity jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1332, 1446 and 1453; and (ii) that the procedural		
23	requirements under 28 U.S.C. § 1446 are met. As such, this action is properly removable to		
24	federal court.		
25	1 In addition to the Complaint and Summons MRUSA is in receipt of some of Plaintiffs' filings		

26

27

28

## <u>nt</u>

## moval Statute

- U.S.C. § 1446 are also satisfied here. a notice of removal "in the district which such action is pending," es a moving party to provide a copy ne state action. The Complaint, e attached hereto as Exhibit A.<sup>1</sup>
- Complaint on December 28, 2016. aid date, and within one year of the A's filing of this Notice of Removal is
- is Notice of Removal are being f the Superior Court of California for

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> In addition to the Complaint and Summons, MBUSA is in receipt of some of Plaintiffs' filings in support of their *ex parte* application for an Order to Show Cause; however, MBUSA is not in possession of the declarations of Raymond Gapasin or Patricia Rubin, and is in possession of only one declaration of Herman Franck.

Copies of this Notice of Removal are also being served upon counsel for the other named defendants.

NOTICE OF REMOVAL